



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

9

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/765,061	01/17/2001	Melanie M. Sohocki	25630/16UTL	7715
23873	7590	04/21/2006		EXAMINER
ROBERT W STROZIER, P.L.L.C				SHIBUYA, MARK LANCE
PO BOX 429				
BELLAIRE, TX 77402-0429			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1639	

DATE MAILED: 04/21/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/765,061	SOHOCKI ET AL	
	Examiner Mark L. Shibuya	Art Unit 1639	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 7/5/2005.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) 1-27 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-27 are pending and restricted.
2. The applicant is respectfully invited to note that claims 1-27 are listed as Groups I-VIII, but in actuality, contain within those claims a **large number of separate and distinct inventions**. Election of a single invention from within this group of claims is required as specifically set forth (see Further Restriction, below).

Election/Restrictions

3. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 1, 2, 4, 6-8, 25, drawn to a composition comprising a polynucleotide sequence selected from polynucleotides, primers, probes, and kits, classifiable in class 536, subclass 24.31.
 - II. Claim 3, drawn to a protein of various SEQ ID Nos. or expressed from a polynucleotide comprising a nucleotide sequence of various SEQ ID Nos., classifiable in class 530, subclass 350.
 - III. Claim 5, drawn to a library comprising anti-sense DNA sequences, each sequence including a mutation of the AIPL1 gene selected from the group consisting of SEQ ID NOs. 9-41, classifiable in class 435, subclass DIG

- IV. Claims 9-13, 21-24, 27, drawn to a method to determine retinal disease comprising determining if a polynucleotide from a cell or sample contains a mutation in an AIPL1 encoding or regulating region, classifiable in class 435, subclass 6.
- V. Claims 14-16, drawn to a method to treat retinal disease comprising administering an effective amount of a protein encoded by a wild type AIPLA1 gene, a polynucleotide sequence of a wild-type AIPL1 gene or a medication designed to ameliorate retinal disease symptoms, classifiable in class 514, subclass 2.
- VI. Claims 17, 18, drawn to method to determine retinal disease comprising determining if a polypeptide from a cell or sample contains a mutation in an AIPL1 encoding or regulating region, classifiable in class 435, subclass 7.1.
- VII. Claims 19 and 20, drawn to a method of producing a cell expressing an AIPL1 mutation comprising transfecting a cell with a polynucleotide sequence having at least one AIPL1 mutation, classifiable in class 435, subclass 455.

VIII. Claim 26, drawn to a method of screening compounds to determine effectiveness in counteracting a mutation in the AIPLA1 gene of a cell, classifiable in class 424, subclass 9.2.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Further Restriction

A) In addition each of Groups I-VIII above reads on patentably distinct Groups. Each of the Groups I-VIII is further divided into multiple groups each representing a different mutation (e.g., Ala336Δ2). It is noted that “a wild-type AIPL1 sequence” or “a mutant AIPL1 sequence” is sometimes claimed (e.g., claim 1); applicant must specify, for example, which “wild-type AIPL1 sequence” is the elected invention. The multiple mutations comprises a different sequence core that has no consensus sequence and no unifying structural relationship with the other mutations, as in the Groups I-VIII, and no shared functional property resulting from their respective mutations. Thus a further restriction is applied to each of Groups I-VIII.

If one of Groups I-II or IV-VIII is elected, the elected **further restricted Group** *must* result in a composition or method comprising a single specific mutation, *i.e.*, a single, identifiable mutation and/or sequence (as in Val33ins 8 bp (GTGATCTT SEQ ID NO: 82).

If either of Groups I and VIII is elected as a combination or mixture, or if Group III, drawn to a library comprising DNA sequences, each sequence corresponding to a DNA sequence including a mutation selected from the group consisting of SEQ ID Nos. 9-41 and mixtures and combinations thereof, is elected, then applicant is required to select one combination of mutants or SEQ ID Nos and to identify the single combination of sequences by their identifiers. This combination will constitute the elected invention. See MPEP 803.04.

For this response to be complete, applicants should identify the selected mutation (or, mixture/combination of mutations, or if Group III is elected, combination of SEQ ID Nos.) and list all of the claims readable upon the elected drug core.

This requirement is not to be taken as an election of species, but rather as an election of a single invention, since each mutation or combination of mutations (as in the library of Group III) is assumed to be a patentably distinct invention, absent evidence to the contrary.

The Inventions of Groups I-III are directed to related compositions and products. The related inventions are distinct if the inventions as claimed do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants; and the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the

instant case, the library of anti-sense DNA sequences of Group III can be used to select antisense oligonucleotides that inhibit gene expression, which is a different mode of operation, function and effect from the polynucleotide sequences of Group I and the proteins of Group II. The polynucleotide sequences of Group I have a materially different design from the protein of Group II by virtue of their different molecular structures (i.e., polynucleotide versus polypeptide).

The Inventions of Groups IV-VIII are directed to related processes. The related inventions are distinct if the inventions as claimed do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants; and the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the methods of determining retinal disease using polynucleotides, as in Group IV or by using polypeptides, as in Group VI, is a different function and effect from methods of treating retinal disease as in Group V, producing a cell expressing an AIPL1 mutation, as in Group VII, or screening compounds to determine effectiveness in counteracting a mutation, as in Group VIII. The methods of determining retinal disease using polynucleotides, as in Group IV or by using polypeptides, as in Group VI, have different designs, modes of operation, and function, by virtue of their different molecular structures (polynucleotide versus polypeptide). The methods of treating retinal disease as in Group V, producing a cell expressing an AIPL1 mutation, as in Group VII, or

screening compounds to determine effectiveness in counteracting a mutation, as in Group VIII have different designs, modes of operation, function and effect.

The Inventions of Groups I-III and the Invention of Groups VIII are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case the method of screening compounds, as in group VIII, may be practiced with peptide-like molecules as potential effective compounds, which are not anti-sense DNA sequences as in Group III, and are also another materially different product from the polynucleotides or proteins of Groups I and II, respectively.

Inventions of Group I and the inventions of Groups IV and VII are related as product and process of use, provided that the elected further Invention of Group I does *not* encode a wild-type gene. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case the products of Group I may be used in order to express antigens for antibody production, which is a different use from the methods of determining retinal disease or producing a cell expressing an AIPL1 mutation, as in Groups IV and VII.

The Inventions of Groups I and the Invention of Group VI are directed to related gene variants and methods therefore. The related inventions are distinct if the inventions as claimed do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants; and the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the further restricted polynucleotide of Group I is different in design and function from the polypeptides of the claimed methods of determining, as in Group VI.

The Inventions of Group I and II and the Invention of Group V are related as product and process of use, to the extent that applicant elects a Further Invention from the Inventions of Groups I and II, wherein the further Invention is the *wild-type* gene or gene product. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case the methods of treatment of Group V may be practiced with peptide-like molecules, which are not proteins or polynucleotides, as in Groups I or II, and therefore are another materially different product.

The Inventions of Groups I and II and the Invention of Group V are directed to related gene variants and methods therefore, to the extent that applicant elects a

Art Unit: 1639

Further Invention from the Inventions of Groups I and II, wherein the further Invention is *not* the *wild-type* gene or gene product. The related inventions are distinct if the inventions as claimed do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants; and the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the further restricted polynucleotides or polypeptides of Groups I and II are mutants, and so are different in design and function from the wild-type polynucleotides and polypeptides of the claimed methods of treatment, as in Group VI.

Inventions of Group II and the Inventions of Groups IV and VII are directed to related gene variants and methods therefore. The related inventions are distinct if the inventions as claimed do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants; and the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the Invention of Group II and the Inventions of Groups IV and VII are distinct, because the Inventions of Group II are drawn to polypeptides and so have a different design and function from the polynucleotides of Groups IV and VII.

Inventions of Group II and the Invention of Group VI are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the

Art Unit: 1639

following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case proteins of Group II may be used to produce antigens by their inoculation, which is a different function from the method of determining if a polypeptide contains a mutation, as in Group IV.

Inventions of Group III and the Inventions of Groups IV-VII are directed to related gene variants and methods therefor. The related inventions are distinct if the inventions as claimed do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants; and the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the library of anti-sense DNA sequences of Group III, have different modes of operation, function effect from the methods of treatment, determining retinal disease with polynucleotides or polypeptides, or producing cells expressing an AIPL1 mutation, as in the Inventions of Groups IV, V, VI and VII.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and the inventions require a different field of search (see MPEP § 808.02), restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. **Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product** will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai*, *In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.**

Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Election of Species

4. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species: A therapeutic method comprising administering: (a) a protein encoded by a

Art Unit: 1639

wild type AIPL1 gene; (b) a polynucleotide sequence of a wild type AIPL1 gene or (c) a retinal medication. The species are independent or distinct because they have materially different design, mode of operation, function and effect.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claim 14 is generic.

5. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species: A detectable label that is: (a) an enzyme; (b) a radioisotope or (c) a fluorochrome. The species are independent or distinct because they have materially different design, mode of operation, function and effect.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claim 24 is generic.

6. Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations

Art Unit: 1639

of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species.

MPEP § 809.02(a).

7. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

8. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim

Art Unit: 1639

remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark L. Shibuya whose telephone number is (571) 272-0806. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8:30AM-5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Wang can be reached on (571) 272-0811. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Mark L. Shibuya
Examiner
Art Unit 1639

ms